DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 187 609 SO 012 518

AUTHOR Farrenkopf, Toni
TITLE Future Educational Process.
PUB DATE Oct 79
NOTE 12p.; Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the World Future Society Education Section (Minneapolis, MN, October, 1979).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Conference Papers; *Conventional Instruction; Course Descriptions; *Educational Needs; Educational Objectives; Experimental Programs; Experimental Teaching; Higher Education; *Process Education; Skill Development; Student Participation; Traditional Schools

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the goals of education which should include the transmission of knowledge, training of skills necessary in a technological society, training of intellectual/abstractive capacities, autonomy and flexibility, and healthy personal and interpersonal functioning. The author argues that a process-oriented classroom approach is more apt to help students reach these goals than traditional classroom teaching methods. Traditional educational practices are almost exclusively preoccupied with content or the assimilation of knowledge. While there is an earnest attempt to teach intellectual skills, knowledge is all too often transmitted by rote and students are mainly motivated by external factors such as grades and credits. Focus on academic content, individual achievement, and competitive training interfere with further adaptive social learning. During his five years of college teaching the author has utilized a process-oriented classroom approach which has helped students achieve the goals listed above. In conjunction with the instructor, students choose the course goals and content and negotiate work contracts and grading contracts. Few restrictions on style or focus are placed on their projects. The course receives very high student evaluations. The author points out, however, that there are problems to this approach. Included among these are the great time and energy demands on the instructor, the difficulty that some students experience with this learning format, and the institutional pressures. (Author/RM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Toni Farrenkopf
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED187609

SP 017 518

FUTURE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS

Toni Farrenkopf, Ph.D.
Oregon Graduate School of Professional Psychology

Introduction

This paper and workshop examines the goals and practices of the educational enterprise from a clinical process perspective. The concept of process denotes the moving forces beneath content; aspects of interaction and relationships, evolution of events, mood and emotional reactions, physical and non-verbal factors.

Educational goals are reviewed and generated, especially in light of future societal needs. Examining traditional educational processes reveals an apparent incongruence between educational goals and practices. This may not be surprising in a "process-blind" society oriented toward content and output. Process-oriented and goal-congruent educational approaches are explored, which includes a survey of educational futurists. A demonstration project translating these approaches into college classroom management is presented, with a discussion of its problem areas.

Educational Goals

Educational goals pertain to the development of the individual as well as to the functioning and survival of society. On the individual level these goals include the transmission of knowledge, training of skills useful and necessary in a technological society, training of intellectual/abstractive capacities (Stone, 1970; Morris, 1976), autonomy and flexibility, and "healthy" personal and interpersonal functioning (Rogers, 1969; Leonard, 1968). The rapid multi-dimensional evolution of our "future shock" society (Toffler, 1970) mandates an interdisciplinary integration of knowledge and intellectual flexibility and creativity which is problem-focused rather than rote memorization of past answers (Theobald, 1978; Botkin, 1978; Dunstan et al., 1970; Kaysen, 1973; Toffler, 1974). We need to move from Newtonian certainty to Heisenberg's uncertainty (Winquist, 1978). The goal of autonomy and personal flexibility (Morris, 1976; Rogers, 1969) seems

Presented to the World Future Society Education Section, Minneapolis, October 1979.

inherent in all socialization and growth processes. The goal of healthy personal functioning entails a number of objectives: individuation (Bowman et al., 1978; Rubin, 1975; Postman and Weingartner, 1969; Kaysen, 1973), social development (Laszlo, 1978; Kaysen, 1973; Toffler, 1970), confidence and self esteem and happiness (Leonard, 1968; Steinberg, 1979). Social development includes moral values (Dewey, 1961; Morris, 1976), social and communicative skills, cooperation (Mood, 1973) and participation (Dunstan et al., 1970; Mood, 1973; Farrenkopf, 1977). The present evolution toward increasing interdependence in dense social environments and a global community underscores the need for cooperation and social skills. Roy Weaver (1979) speaks of three increasingly desirable levels of personal functioning: the reactive coping mode, the adapting mode and the pro-active shaping mode.

From a collective societal view education serves the adaptive evolution and survival of mankind by preserving and further developing civilization's accomplishments, by facilitating social homeostasis (e.g. a participatory democratic political system) as well as by facilitating cultural mutation via diversity and flexibility. It can be seen that the above individual goals feed directly into these societal goals. In that sense education is a survival endeavor of the collective human species (Postman and Weingartner, 1969). It should also be noted that the majority of the goals generated in this section deal with process rather than content.

Traditional Educational Process

Examining traditional educational practices, we find almost exclusive preoccupation with content: the assimilation of knowledge. Besides neglecting other--and possibly "higher"--needs, this preoccupation reinforces and conditions the process-blindness so characteristic of contemporary people and society. There is an earnest attempt at training intellectual skills; however, knowledge is all-too-often transmitted by rote and usually by compartmentalization and specialization. Students are motivated by external factors such as grades and credits, which often become end goals in themselves, thereby further sabotaging the assimilation of knowledge. Lastly, the operant conditioning literature (Skinner, 1971; Wolpe, 1969)

has shown that aversive control mechanisms are generally not effective in achieving lasting behavioral goals.

Instead of fostering autonomy, students receive ample dependency training in an autocratic and hierarchical system (Farber, 1970; Haney and Zimbardo, 1975). They are conditioned to be dependent in their relationship to authority and in their relationship to knowledge (Leonard, 1968). Mass treatment in large classes and in the cumbersome bureaucracy of a mass educational system hardly serves the individuation process. Development of social skills is generally presumed to have taken place during the Kindergarten and early school years. Focus on academic content, individual achievement and competitive training interfere with further adaptive social learning. College counseling centers are teeming with the victims of this process. Conditioning students to be passive absorbers and to be dependent on authority seems a poor preparation for a participatory democratic social system. Aversive control and emphasis on external rewards (Kirschenbaum et al., 1971) leads to the learning of avoidance behavior and a psychopathic amoral approach to achievement.

Dependency training, passivity, rendering the learning process into hard and painful work, competition, aversive control and punishment all work against the development of confidence, self esteem and the adaptive experience of happiness (Leonard, 1968). Thus, common educational practices seem incongruent with the educational goals generated above.

Process-oriented Process

Applying a process perspective to the described educational goals will point directly to the educational approaches and instructional methods appropriate to these goals.

Content assimilation may be enhanced by positive reinforcement, active learning and intrinsic motivation (Keller et al., 1974; Wolpe, 1969). Student autonomy and responsibility should be fostered, thereby modeling democratic principles and promoting self concept (Neill, 1960; Dewey, 1961; Goodman, 1968; Rubin, 1975; Postman and Weingartner, 1969; Kaysen, 1973; Pulliam et al., 1975). The student-as-person, with his/her intellectual-social-emotional needs and development should be addressed (Glasser, 1969; Rubin, 1975; Van Norman, 1976; Bowman et al., 1978). Social development

is fostered by cooperative group learning (Leonard, 1968; Mood, 1973; Pulliam et al., 1975) as well as by the formal training of human relations skills (Rubin, 1975; Van Norman, 1976). Students are to be actively participating in the learning process (Dunstan et al., 1970; Kaysen, 1973; Rubin, 1975; Agor, 1978). Farrenkopf and Lehtinen (1973) presented a scale of increasing student participation in their learning, ranging from reading and listening to writing, discussing to experiencing, conducting field work, presenting and assisting to teach the course.

The employment of positive reinforcement contingencies, with a minimum or absence of aversive techniques, promotes self esteem and a sense of personal well being. Autonomy and responsibility, individualized social-emotional attention, active participation, cooperative group learning and positive reinforcement should all promote intrinsic motivation, thereby decreasing the need for maladaptive external motivational measures.

These goal-congruent educational processes have been advocated increasingly over the past decade, representing many educational futurists. The first annual assembly of the World Future Society's Education Section in Houston, Texas in October 1978 featured as many as 35 presentations on holistic, process-oriented education (Farrenkopf, 1979). The open education movement is well known for its advocacy of the described approaches (Neill, 1960; Stephens, 1974; Brown, 1975).

Instructional Methods

The following demonstration project of a process-oriented classroom approach has been developed by the author over five years of teaching at two American state universities.

Students experience self management in the areas of course format as well as selection of content work. In conjunction with the instructor they formulate the course goals, negotiate work contracts and grading contracts. They choose from a wide selection of readings and projects, generated by the instructor as well as the students. Few restrictions on style or focus are placed on their weekly papers. Consequently, student work shows diversity, personal relevance and enthusiasm.

The aim of dealing with each student as an individual and as a "whole person" is in part addressed by allowing such mentioned autonomy. Individual work/grading contracts and individual consultation take place. The relationship between students and instructor is personalized, de-emphasizing status differences and including personal/guiding feedback. The class atmosphere is personal and cordial; instructor and students know each other's names. A good amount of class work takes place in non-competitive small groups, which fosters social learning.

The afore-given scale of student participation in the learning process is used in its entirety, emphasizing the active end: class discussions, creative papers, field research and experiences, multi-media class presentations, compilation and editing of a class book (copies for every member), organization of events and panels, a final class convention.

Positive reinforcement is used in shaping work and learning. All work and effort is rewarded with points, while quality is safeguarded and shaped by contracts, individualized feedback and bonus points. Inadequate work is returned for further effort. Papers are read for their strengths, with abundant positive comments pulling for more. In discussions all student comments are accepted and valued; praise is abundant, criticism minimized. This approach is facilitated by personalized relations and knowledge of the individuals. In line with learning theory data, student output is abundant. One consequence is a high class grade average, resembling that achieved under the "Keller plan" (Keller et al., 1974). While grade inflation is a sensitive issue in many circles, Mood (1973) advocates the abandonment of education's present certification function in favor of its teaching/learning function.

The physical parameters of the classroom are marked by circle seating, a personalized environmental setting, clustered circular group meetings in-and-outside of the classroom, frequent visitors, sometimes refreshments. The students organize their final convention at some pleasant and comfortable place on-or-off campus, usually with refreshments. The convention includes student presentations and the social-emotional termination of a class experience.

Students consistently rate this learning experience on the extreme positive pole of course evaluation scales, emphasizing personal growth, intellectual stimulation and arousal, relevance, comfort and enjoyment,

gratifying group functioning and friendships, increase of work output and less absenteeism.

Problems

One obvious problem of this classroom approach is its great time-and-energy demand on the instructor. To deal with students on an intensive individual basis requires many consultations with individuals and small groups, becoming acquainted with each student and monitoring their activities, attitudes and feelings. Attempts to meet these additional demands include the use of some class time for group work and consultations, reduction of student-teacher ratio via employment of teaching assistants and class members aiding in the management of the class. This approach seems to work best in smaller classes and seminars.

An added demand is also placed on the instructor as a person: besides being a scholar and lecturer he/she functions as a guide and counselor. This requires interpersonal awareness and skills.

A second problem is the difficulty that some students experience with this learning format. They seem ill-prepared for directing their own learning and for participating responsibly in the decision making process (Pierce, 1976). At best, it requires some time for them to switch gears and lower their competitive/paranoid guards. For this reason the described approach seems to work better on a semester schedule as compared to a quarter schedule. Such shortcoming clearly underscore the need for this type of training to occur early in the students' lives, and it may be a comfort to see the open education movement and other developments (e.g. the "Early Childhood Education" program) making inroads at the elementary levels (Education Tomorrow, 1976).

A third problem facing this approach is institutional pressures, such as the system's and colleagues' emphasis on evaluation and standards, the reaction against grade inflation, constricting administrative regulation of course formats and content, instructor peer evaluation via lecture and the usual inertia of any social system in protecting the status quo. These harsh socialization pressures from authoritarian social climates added to the afore-mentioned stressful overload has been seen to stunt the idealism of many teachers, leading to an ungratifying conformity with traditional practices (Loewenthal et al., 1976; Haney et al., 1975).

EDUCATIONAL GOALS	TRADITIONAL PROCESS	PROCESS-ORIENTED PROCESS	INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS
-- transmit knowledge, train skills	-- emphasis! (but sabotaged via aversive control) (process blindness)	-- content assimilation enhanced via intrinsic motivation, positive reinforcement, active learning	
-- train intellectual skills	-- emphasis		
integrative, interdisciplinary	specialize, compartmentalize		-- synthesizing papers
-- train autonomy, flexibility	-- dependence on authority dependence on structure, dogmatism	-- self management, responsibility	-- democratic decision making, work/grading contracts
-- healthy functioning	-- mass treatment	-- individualized social-emotional attention	-- individual contracts, student-teacher relationship, personal class atmosphere, reduce student-teacher ratio (TA's)
- individuation			
- social development			
moral values			
social skills		social skills training	group performance feedback
cooperation	competition	cooperative group work	group projects
participation	passivity	active participation	field projects, student presentations, group work
- confidence, self esteem	lack confidence low self esteem	positive reinforcement	reward all work, mastery system, bonus points
- happiness	hard work aversive control avoidance behavior	intrinsic motivation	
Society:			
-- preserve/develop accomplishments			
-- facilitate social homeostasis (democratic system)			
-- facilitate cultural mutation via diversity/flexibility			

FUTURE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS -- TONI FARRENKOPF 1979

References

Agor, W. Policy mechanisms the state can use to encourage restructuring of education for the future. World Future Society Education Section, Houston, October, 1978.

Botkin, J. A new international learning order. World Future Society Education Section, Houston, October, 1978.

Bowman, J., Kierstead, F., Dede, C., Pulliam, J. The far side of the future: social problems and educational reconstruction. Washington: World Future Society, 1978.

Brown, G. (Ed.) The live classroom. New York: Viking Press, 1975.

Dewey, J. Philosophy of education. Paterson: Littlefield, Adams and Co., 1961.

Dunstan, M., Garlan, P. Worlds in the making. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Education Tomorrow. Open learning programs increase. June 1976.

Farber, J. The student as a nigger. New York: Pocket Books, 1970.

Farrenkopf, T. Process: clinician in the classroom. Los Angeles: California State Psychological Association, March 1977.

_____. Some themes from the Houston conference. Education Tomorrow, April 1979.

_____, Lehtinen, S. Student involvement in their courses. University of Massachusetts, 1973.

Glasser, W. Schools without failure. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

Goodman, P. Freedom and learning: the need for choice. Saturday Review, May 1968.

Haney, C., Zimbardo, P. It's tough to tell a high school from a prison. Psychology Today, June 1975.

Kaysen, C. (Ed.) Content and context. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Keller, F., Sherman, J. The Keller plan handbook. Menlo Park: W.A. Benjamin, 1974.

Kirschenbaum, H., Napier, R., Simon, S. Wad-ja-get? The grading game in American education. New York: Hart Publishing Company, 1971.

Laszlo, E. Keynote Address. World Future Society Education Section, Houston, October 1978.

Leonard, G. Education and ecstacy. New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1978.

Loewenthal, A., Nielsen, R. The rocky road to academic democracy. American Teacher, March 1976.

Mood, A. The future of higher education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Morris, V., Pai, Y. Philosophy and the American school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1976.

Neill, A. Summerhill. New York: Hart Publishing Company, 1960.

Pierce, G. A close look at the open classroom. American Teacher, May 1976.

Postman, N., Weingartner, C. Teaching as a subversive activity. New York: Delacorte Press, 1969.

Pulliam, J., Bowman, R. Educational futurism. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1975.

Rogers, C. Freedom to learn. Columbus: Merrill, 1969.

Rubin, L. (Ed.) The future of education: perspectives on tomorrow's schooling. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1975.

Skinner, B. Beyond freedom and dignity. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1972.

Steinberg, L. Helping students confront the future. Los Angeles Unified School District futures workshop, Los Angeles, April 1979.

Stephens, L. The teacher's guide to open education. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.

Stone, J. Instruction--higher education's prime challenge. California State Polytechnic University, 1970.

Theobald, R. Keynote Address. World Future Society Education Section, Houston, October 1978.

Toffler, A. Future Shock. New York: Random House, 1970.

_____ (Ed.) Learning for tomorrow. New York: Vintage Books, 1974.

Van Norman, R. Teacher education toward the 21st century. Education Tomorrow, December 1976.

Weaver, R. What are the basic skills for the future? Los Angeles Unified School District futures workshop, Los Angeles, April 1979.

Winquist, R. Quantum mechanics, consciousness and the future of education. World Future Society Education Section, Houston, October 1978.

Wolpe, J. The practice of behavior therapy. New York: Pergamon Press, 1969.

FUTURE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS

EDUCATIONAL GOALS	LEARNING PROCESS	SYSTEM'S PROCESS
transmit knowledge train skills multiple skills/careers	- enhance content assimilation via intrinsic motivation, positive reinforcement, active learning	← allow more teacher time; inservice training days; fund continuing education for teachers, staff development, T-groups/retreats, workshops in human relations; build support system; employ staff development consultants; develop instructional teams.
train intellectual skills information processing research integrative, interdisciplinary future awareness process awareness intuition decision skills	- multi-sensory experiences	
physical skills, health	- mind-body integration	
train autonomy flexibility creativity individuation value clarification self awareness	- teacher as facilitator democratic self-management/ responsibility flexibility/choice	selection/matching of principals, human relations/systems training employ systems consultant
social development civilize, socialize moral/ethical values social/communicative skills	- individualized social-emotional attention - social skills training	
participation cooperation conflict resolution skills	- active participation/ experiential learning/ exploration	
confidence, self-esteem	- cooperative group learning	training of superintendent (district, state); elect educational professional instead of political appointment; systems consultant
happiness/joy/self actualization	integrate learner with school system and community	
pleasure in learning	- positive reinforcement, support change grading system to: mastery system contract system intrinsic motivation	
r society:		
preserve/develop accomplishments		
facilitate social homeostasis, citizenship, politicize, globalize	- teacher/facilitator modeling	
facilitate cultural mutation via diversity/flexibility/ creativity	- supportive physical environment: pleasant, stimulating, personal, social	← community need assessment; community education; educational programs in public media;
value clarification		

FUTURE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS, WORKSHOP - TONI FARRENKOPF; WORLD FUTURE SOCIETY EDUCATION SECTION: MINNEAPOLIS, OCTOBER 1979